

### REMARKS

The Office Action indicated that this was a Final Office Action.

An attempt was made to contact Examiner Butler and based on his unavailability, a telephone conference was conducted with SPE Examiner Mackey. Attached is a copy of the Interview Summary wherein the applicant was informed that the Office Action should not have been made Final, and that a new Office Action would be submitted.

On February 7, 2007, a phone message was left with Examiner Butler inquiring into the status of a new Office Action that would not be made Final. Since a response has not been received, applicant is filing this response based upon the assumption that the Office Action of November 30, 2006 is not a Final Office Action per the representation in the attached Interview Summary.

The Office Action held that Claims 1-9 are rendered obvious over *Takemoto et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,366,110) in view of *Takemoto et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,429,362) under 35 U.S.C. §103.

The *Takemoto et al.* '110 reference was seeking to address a clogging problem when only a single token hopper was utilized, particularly when a rotary drum was used to separate and space tokens. See Column 1, Lines 18-24.

To resolve these problems, the *Takemoto et al.* '110 reference taught the use of multiple approach sensors, seen for example in Figure 5, in combination with a preliminary hopper 4 and a dispensing hopper 7. Thus, an approach sensor 2 was mounted on the wall of the preliminary hopper 4. The preliminary hopper had a volume capacity of about 300 tokens with the approach sensor 2 attached to a side portion of the preliminary hopper 4, not for the purpose of counting the tokens, but simply for detecting a level of tokens therein.

A conveyor belt 3 is mounted horizontally to release the tokens to the dispensing hopper 7. See Column 3, Lines 47-59. The dispensing hopper is in the form of a circular tube that could hold between 150 to 200 tokens and again, an approach sensor 5 was used for detecting the level of tokens in the dispensing hopper 7. See Column 3, Lines 60-64. A ring-shaped friction belt would spin the tokens in the dispensing hopper so that they would be released in a one-by-one basis into a dispensing path 15 that was controlled by a shutter 13.

Figure 6 shows a perspective view of the first preliminary hopper 4, while Figure 7 showed a perspective view of the dispensing hopper 7.

As can be appreciated, the approaching sensors 2 and 5 are incapable of counting a number of tokens contained therein, and simply determine an approximate level of tokens. The dispensing path 15 utilizes a counting sensor 16 for counting the tokens as they pass along the path 15.

The *Takemoto et al.* '110 patent discloses a schematic circuit diagram which permits a CPU to monitor the level of tokens in both preliminary hopper 4 and the dispensing hopper 7. Additionally, the count sensor 16 is used in correlation with a solenoid 23 that controls the shutter 13.

Thus, a solution to the clogging problem addressed in the *Takemoto et al.* '110 patent was to control the level of tokens in both the preliminary hopper 4 and in the second dispenser hopper 7, and to deliver the desired dispensed number of tokens ultimately to a receiving tray or plate 10, which also has an approach sensor 12 for again monitoring the level of tokens in the tray. A user can open a closure or lid 8 to physically remove the tokens from the tray shown in Figure 5.

In summary, the use of three approach or level sensors, one in a preliminary hopper 4, a second sensor in the dispenser hopper 7, and a third approach or token level sensor in the dispensing tray 10 monitors the flow of tokens to thereby minimize clogging problems that can occur especially with a rotating friction disk 6 in a dispensing hopper.

The Office Action asserted that our second sensor unit, for example as set forth in Claim 1 of our application, and which senses a container in a position to receive a release token, was purportedly taught in Column 4, Lines 5-19. Column 4, Lines 5-19, however, simply disclosed correlation between the approach sensor 12 and the counting sensor 16 shown in Figure 5, wherein the shutter 13 can be driven by the CPU and the circuit, Figure 12, when a certain level of coins is sensed by the level or approach sensor 12 on the receiving plate 10.

Thus, the *Takemoto et al.* '110 patent cannot teach the features asserted in Column 4, Lines 5-19. As will be subsequently discussed, the *Takemoto et al.* '362 patent does disclose a sensor for sensing a container at a position to receive tokens.

The Office Action further contended on Page 3 that our control unit, for example as set forth in Claim 1 and as further defined, alternatively, in the independent Claims 4 and 7, was found in *Takemoto et al.* '110 patent. The control unit, however, as described in the Office Action, is a paraphrase of a control unit language of our Claim 1 and is not supported by either the approach sensor 12 defined in the *Takemoto et al.* '110 patent, nor by the container sensor 9 shown in Figure 3 of the *Takemoto et al.* '362 reference.

The *Takemoto et al.* '110 reference discloses its display sign features to the user in Figure 2, Column 3, Lines 32-40. Basically, a slot is shown to receive a 1,000 yen paper currency in order to dispense 50 tokens. As can be appreciated, the supply of tokens is divided into the token reservoir B shown in Figure 12.

The preliminary hopper 4 that can hold about 300 tokens, and the dispensing hopper 7 that can hold approximately 150 to 200 tokens. See Column 3, Lines 60-63. Thus, the dispensing of 50 tokens will initially come from the rotation of the friction ring 7 in the dispensing hopper, where only a limited number of tokens are stored. The display 14 simply provides visual indicators that "Dispensing" is happening or it has stopped, and the ongoing counting of tokens by the counting sensor 16 adjacent the shutter 13 is occurring. See Figure 7.

Thus, the *Takemoto et al.* '110 reference is not able to teach any control unit that deals with a container to be positioned to receive tokens, nor is it capable of addressing the issue of a variable amount of tokens, that would be greater, for example, than the 50 tokens to be dispensed. Apparently if two 1,000 yen bills are inserted, there is no teaching in the drawings or the specification as to how the *Takemoto et al.* '110 reference would address the request for tokens greater than 50. This is above and beyond the fact that the *Takemoto et al.* '110 reference does not even show a use of one container, let alone the sequential use and control of the distribution of tokens, when they are greater than the capacity of a single container.

Our present invention is directed to these issues, and provides a token-dispensing apparatus with structural claim elements that enable the automatic activation through a control unit of sequential containers with a monitoring of the removal of an initial container and the proper counting of tokens to a second or third container.

As we have previously mentioned, the provision of an automatic and accurate dispensing of tokens to a plurality of containers, while minimizing labor requirements, is a desirable feature in the gambling and game art field. Thus, a large number of tokens can be dispensed to a user in a highly efficient manner in order to service a large number of customers without the overhead costs of an employee providing this service. Additionally, by "packaging" the tokens in a

plurality of containers sequentially, and in an automatic manner, a larger number of customers can be efficiently served from the same kiosk.

A casino wants their customer base utilizing their time gambling or playing the dispensed tokens and not waiting in line to exchange currency for tokens. The additional costs of multiple containers is an acceptable overhead to satisfy this customer base.

None of the references of record address nor suggest this automatic dispensing of tokens between a machine and a user, with the accommodation of multiple containers to facilitate a user's desire to have a large number of tokens at one transaction.

Our control unit as defined, for example, in Claim 1, can be readily understood from our flowchart of Figure 3 so that by monitoring an input from the user to designate the number of tokens to be released and enables a container to automatically drop a container into a dispensing section, having a specific container sensor. When the container receives the predetermined number of tokens, a display can be provided to the user to remove the container and if a predetermined period of time passes without removal of the container, an error signal can be generated. A container sensor monitors when the initial container is removed and causes a display removal indicia to be extinguished. The control unit can calculate the new number of tokens to be released based on the remaining amount, initially designated by the user, and a second container is automatically located at the dispensing section and sensed by the container sensor.

As can be appreciated, an additional series of containers can repeat this procedure until all of the designated tokens have been delivered to the user.

Since the above remarks establish that the *Takemoto et al.* '110 patent has been improperly relied upon as a teaching of elements of the present invention as set forth in our

claims, it becomes incumbent upon the secondary *Takemoto et al.* '362 to provide a motivation to find each of the elements in our claims.

As the Examiner is aware, the hard question is whether the combination is based upon hindsight from the present teaching rather than what would be obvious apart from the present teaching to a person of ordinary skill in this field.

As set forth in *In re Kahn*, 441 F.3d 977, 987-988 (Fed. Cir. 2006):

The motivation-suggestion-teaching test picks up where the analogous art test leaves off and informs the *Graham* analysis. [*Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 13-14 (1966).]

To reach a non-hindsight driven conclusion as to whether a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have viewed the subject matter as a whole to have been obvious in view of multiple references, the Board must provide some rationale, articulation, or reasoned basis to explain why the conclusion of obviousness is correct. The requirement of such an explanation is consistent with governing obviousness law. . . .

\* \* \*

A suggestion, teaching, or motivation to combine the relevant prior art teachings does not have to be found explicitly in the prior art, as "the teaching, motivation, or suggestion may be implicit from the prior art as a whole, rather than expressly stated in the references. . . . The test for an implicit showing is what the combined teachings, knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art, and the nature of the problem to be solved as a whole would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art." However, rejections on obviousness grounds cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness. This requirement is as much rooted in the Administrative Procedure Act [for our review of Board determinations], which ensures due process and non-arbitrary decision making, as it is in §103.

As can be appreciated, the more that the cited references must be modified to meet the outstanding claims, the more likely that an unintended issue of hindsight may drive the rejection.

This is particularly true for an Examiner who is attempting to provide a diligent effort to ensure that only patentable subject matter occurs. The difficult issue is to step back from the zeal of the examination process and to appreciate that the Patent Examiner has to wear both hats of advocating a position relative to the prior art, while at the same time objectively rendering in a judge-like manner, a decision on the patentability of the present claims.

Using the above motivation-suggestion-teaching test balanced by the reality of the circumstances of what a person of ordinary skill in this field would glean from the problems addressed and the technical solutions offered in the respective two *Takemoto et al.* references, it is respectfully submitted that neither of these references recognize or provide the advantages of the present invention in the highly competitive field in which the present invention exists.

The *Takemoto et al.* '362 reference is relevant in teaching a provision of a paper cup to remove the problems of a player physically scooping up the coins from a tray, which was required in the *Takemoto et al.* '110 reference. Thus, Takatoshi Takemoto and a new inventor, Kazunari Kawashima, recognized approximately two years after the *Takemoto et al.* '110 patent was filed, that scooping coins from a tray was both unsanitary and would make the user's hands dirty. See Column 1, Lines 18-21.

To address this issue, an auxiliary mounting of simply a conventional, manual storage portion for a plurality of stacked paper cups was appended to the exterior of a medal dispenser for a slot machine. The first embodiment has the user manually removing a cup by pulling it downward and then aligning and inserting it on a supporting member 4. Thus, as disclosed in Figure 2, a plate 10 is horizontally mounted to the lower side portion of the housing of a conventional coin dispenser while the storage portion 5 for storing the stacked paper cups "enables removal of the cups one by one by a player's hands from its lower portion." See

Column 2, Lines 9-11. Thus, a paper cup is manually taken out from the lower portion of the storage portion 5 and is set on a supporting member 4 that also incorporates a sensor 9 to detect the paper cup.

As can be readily appreciated, the paper money inlet 1 receives a monetary bill with a first display 6 showing the amount of money inserted and the second display 7 indicates the number of coins that are to be dispensed. A switch 8 can be activated after the user has manually placed the paper cup on the supporting member 4. As noted in Column 2, Lines 26-27, "a player may alternatively hold a cup just under the discharge outlet 2 for receiving coins in a paper cup.

Another alternative embodiment as noted in Column 2, Lines 45-47, would have the coins dispensed from the outlet 3A in Figure 1, when the user lifts the cup upward from the supporting member 4.

Finally, a lever L shown in Figure 2 can act as a barrier to hold the desired number of coins in the tray 3 until the user moves a paper cup to the supporting member 4. Presumably a manual movement of the lever then permits the coins to drop by gravity into the paper cup.

As noted, the teaching of the function of the sensor 9 is as follows in Column 2, Lines 18-19. "...the sensor 9 detects the paper cup and coins can be discharged."

The Office Action contended that our control unit was taught by the disclosure in Column 2, Lines 28-40. This disclosure, however, simply describes a second embodiment of the invention, wherein purportedly a transfer apparatus can replace the manual operation by the user. That is, prongs 11A apparently grasp the lowermost cup in the stack of cups at the storage portion 5, pulls the cup downward and then slides it horizontally to reposition it at the supporting member 4, thereby activating the sensor 9 to permit the coins to be discharged.



As can be readily appreciated, this automatizing of simply the manual operation of the user pulling the cup from a stack and then locating it on the mounting rim 4 to enable the dispensing of a fixed amount of coins, does not teach a control unit that receives an output from a first sensor unit that senses the number of tokens released and compares it with a predetermined value representative of the desired capacity of the container to hold tokens, and compares the predetermined desired capacity with the total number of tokens requested, and thereby enables an automatic releasing of a second container to receive a second supply of tokens which may either constitute the final full amount of tokens or only a partial amount of tokens that were purchased.

Thus, as described in our Claim 1, when the initial container is removed, our control unit can automatically activate a container separating unit to release a second container, and once the second container is sensed at the dispensing position, our control unit can activate the token selector unit to continue to release tokens under monitoring of the control unit.

In short, the teachings of the *Takemoto et al.* '362 patent to simply automatize the manual labor function of the user in removing the initial container from a stack of containers and then locating it at the mounting unit, does not address the dispensing of large quantities of tokens beyond the capacity of any individual container, which is the purpose of our present invention.

While the *Takemoto et al.* '110 patent may be able to address the jamming problems associated with a rotating friction disk by utilizing a preliminary hopper and a dispensing hopper for delivering tokens to a tray to be manually removed, and the *Takemoto et al.* '110 patent may suggest in one embodiment, automatically dispensing an initial container to thereby enable the requested tokens to be dispensed, to prevent the user from soiling his hands or having unsanitary contact with a tray, neither of these references recognize nor provide a motivation to utilize our

sensor inputs, the storage capacity of individual containers, and the capability of dispensing a greater number of tokens than the capacity of any one container in an automatic manner to efficiently present a plurality of containers with the desired purchased number of tokens to the user, as defined by our claims.

Additionally, the *Takemoto et al.* '362 patent would have a bulky exterior or an appendage transfer mechanism on the exterior of the token dispensing apparatus, and would not facilitate an automatic dispensing and dropping of the lowermost container directly into the dispensing tray as shown in Figure 1 of our present invention and as defined in our current claims. See Paragraph 0025 of our specification.

Additionally, our display unit has the capacity of informing the user to remove a filled container.

As can be appreciated, the initial Office Action rejection relied upon Japanese Patent No. 2,860,818, which taught two modes of operation, namely when a limited number of medals were to be dispensed, a gate 2 was open and the medals were dispensed directly onto the floor or receiving section of the dispensing tray. If, however, a large number of medals were to be dispensed, the gate 2 was closed and a container was dropped onto a pedestal, and a larger number of tokens were then dispensed through a second dispensing opening 5.

This teaching, like the present *Takemoto et al.* '362 patent, simply places a container at a dispensing location. It does not teach a control unit that automatically activated a container separating unit to release a second container. The newly-cited *Takemoto et al.* '362 accordingly, does not provide any further teaching than that of the previous Japanese patent. In fact, the *Takemoto et al.* '362 patent does not even address the issue of dispensing different numbers of tokens, namely one where it would be dispensed to a tray and when a larger number of tokens

were to be dispensed, a container capable of receiving a greater number of tokens would be provided. The *Takemoto et al.* '362 patent simply provides a container with the implicit teaching that the container would receive all the tokens, and thereby not soil the user's hands by contacting a tray.

Our present invention, as shown in the flowchart of Figure 3, has the capacity to keep releasing containers and recomputing the number of tokens that are to be received in each succeeding container until the full allotment of tokens are discharged. Use of a plurality of containers expedites the receipt and removal of the tokens, and permits a fast and efficient utilization of our token dispensing device.

Our Claim 4 defined an overflow preventing unit which outputs a removal signal to the user for removing a container located at the dispensing section when the amount detecting unit detects the predetermined amount of tokens in the container. Our container detecting unit can then detect a subsequent container located at the dispensing section and the remaining amount dispensing unit then enables a token dispensing unit and a container dispensing unit, if there are no containers at the dispensing unit, to release a second container and then to receive the remaining allotment of tokens.

Independent Claim 7 calls for a container sensing unit at a dispensing section and an amount detecting unit for sensing the amount of tokens released into the container dispensing section. We, however, employ an overflow preventing unit, including a display visible to a user, to output a removal signal for removing the container and a stopping signal for the token dispensing unit when the amount detecting unit detects the predetermined amount of tokens that can be held in a container.

Additionally, our control unit acts upon the detection of the existence of a container and fills the container with a predetermined amount of tokens representative of the capacity of the container. Once this filled container is timely removed, the display unit can provide an indication of both the status of the filled container and its removal, and a second container can be released and a new dispensing number that has been computed based on the remaining amount of tokens that have been purchased, can then be released. This cycle can repeat itself until the total amount of tokens are released in accordance with the flowchart of Figure 3. See also the method steps of new Claim 11.


Our dependent claims provide additional features which have not been addressed in either of the *Takemoto et al.* cited references. Additionally, we have defined in a new dependent claim, the gravity feed of the release of the container directly to a dispensing section in Claim 10. Thus, the bulky and potentially more expensive configuration of the transferring apparatus 11 defined in the *Takemoto et al.* '362 patent is avoided.

In view of the above remarks, it is believed that the case is now in condition for allowance and an early notification of the same is requested.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone interview will help further the prosecution of this case, the undersigned attorney can be contacted at the listed phone number.

Very truly yours,

**SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.**

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'Joseph W. Price', is written over a horizontal line. The signature is stylized with large loops and a long horizontal stroke extending to the left.

Joseph W. Price  
Registration No. 25,124  
600 Anton Boulevard, Suite 1400  
Costa Mesa, California 92626-7689  
Telephone: (714) 427-7420  
Facsimile: (714) 427-7799



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

## Fax Cover Sheet

Date: 08 Dec 2006

To: Joe Price	From: Patrick H. Mackey
Application/Control Number: 10782,304	Art Unit: 3653
Fax No.: 714-427-7799	Phone No.: (571) 272-6916
Voice No.: 714-427-7000	Return Fax No.:
Re:	CC:
<input type="checkbox"/> Urgent <input type="checkbox"/> For Review <input type="checkbox"/> For Comment <input type="checkbox"/> For Reply <input type="checkbox"/> Per Your Request	

Comments:

Re: s/n 10/782,304

DKA # 42530-6600

Number of pages 3 including this page

## STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY

This facsimile transmission is an Official U.S. Government document which may contain information which is privileged and confidential. It is intended only for use of the recipient named above. If you are not the intended recipient, any dissemination, distribution or copying of this document is strictly prohibited. If this document is received in error, you are requested to immediately notify the sender at the above indicated telephone number and return the entire document in an envelope addressed to:

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**Interview Summary****Application No.**

10/782,304

**Applicant(s)**

TEZUKA, KENICHI

**Examiner**

Patrick H. Mackey

**Art Unit**

3653

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Patrick H. Mackey (3) \_\_\_\_\_  
 (2) Joe Price (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 07 December 2006.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
 c) ☐ Personal (copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative


Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.  
 If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) discussed: All Original.Identification of prior art discussed: N/A.Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The SPE informed the Attorney that the Office Action mailed should not have been made Final, a new Office Action will be submitted, and the applicant's time period for response will be restarted.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

  
 PATRICK MACKEY  
 SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
 TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an  
 Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Examiner's signature, if required

## Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

**Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record**  
A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

### Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

Paragraph (b)  
In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135, (38 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.  
The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.  
It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiner's Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Form is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner.  
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

### Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.